



RECEIVED

DEC 27 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

Application No. 09/673,946.
Examiner: William C. Doerrler

**Applicant: LU, YINGZHONG
Art Unit: 3744**

RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE ACTION

December 16, 2002

Priority*

Note: The original application including a claim of Foreign Patent Priority Date(08/23/2001 in the PRC) was filed via electron filing system ePAVE, without attaching a certified copy of said foreign patent. In the incoming Office Action, the relevant information on Priority was missing (maybe a correspondence error). Herein I enclose a certified copy of the Chinese application, issued by the Chinese Bureau of Intelligence Properties (Chinese PTO) as required by 35 U.S.C. 119B. An English translation of the original Certificate (in Chinese) is also attached for your reference. Please accept this amendment.

1

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Response: All the indefinite and unclear points in said original claims as cited have been corrected and, with further revisions as described below, the Revised Claims with well-defined terms particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the patentability of said invention are re-submitted at the end of this responses document.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Response: The original Claim 1 has been further revised to distinctly claim the patentability of said invention by specifically addressing the substantial differences between said invention and all the prior arts as cited. The Revised Claim 1 is re-submitted as an independent claim in the “Revised Claims” at the end of this responses document.

The original Claims 2-4 have been further revised and re-submitted as dependent claims 2-5 in the “Revised Claims” at the end of this responses document.

The original Claims 7 has been further revised and re-submitted in the “Revised Claims” as dependent claims 6 at the end of this responses document.

The original Claims 11 has been further revised and re-submitted in the “Revised Claims” as dependent claims 7 at the end of this responses document.

The original Claims 5-6 and 8-10 (a total of five original claims) are dropped.

Explanation of the Grounds of the Revisions

A. On Revisions of the original Claim 1

The **new and useful improvements** of my present invention over all the prior arts as cited lies in **my innovative idea of integrating two different gas separation processes into a "hybrid (dual) process"** capable of simultaneously performing **gas dehydration and higher hydrocarbons recovery in an energy-efficient and cost-effective way superior than most of the prior arts, particularly the State-of-the-arts commercial products, e.g., the glycol dehydrators and the cryogenic separation plants.** The apparatus using said hybrid process is designated as a